

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
CENTRAL DIVISION**

CHARLES FLICK,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 12-4246-CV-DPR
)	
CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting)	
Commissioner of Social Security, ¹)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

An Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) denied Supplemental Security Income to Plaintiff Charles Flick in a decision dated January 10, 2011 (Tr. 11-20). The Appeals Counsel denied review. Thus, the ALJ’s decision became the Commissioner of Social Security’s final decision denying Social Security Disability benefits. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); 20 C.F.R. § 416.1481. For the reasons set forth below, the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is **AFFIRMED**.

LEGAL STANDARDS

Judicial review of a denial of disability benefits is limited to whether there is substantial evidence on the record as a whole to support the Social Security Administration’s decision. 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); *Minor v. Astrue*, 574 F.3d 625, 627 (8th Cir. 2009). Substantial evidence is “such evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971) (quoting *Consolidated Edison Co. V. NLRB*, 305 U.S. 197, 229 (1938)). “Substantial evidence on the record as a whole,” however,

¹ Carolyn W. Colvin became the Acting Commissioner of Social Security on February 14, 2013. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d), Carolyn W. Colvin is substituted for Michael J. Astrue as defendant in this action.

requires a more exacting analysis, which also takes into account “whatever in the record fairly detracts from its weight.” *Minor*, 574 F.3d at 627 (quoting *Wilson v. Sullivan*, 886 F.2d 172, 175 (8th Cir. 1989)). Thus, where it is possible to draw two inconsistent conclusions from the evidence, and one conclusion represents the ALJ’s findings, a court must affirm the decision. See *Robinson v. Sullivan*, 956 F.2d 836, 838 (8th Cir. 1992) (citing *Cruse v. Bowen*, 867 F.2d 1183, 1184 (8th Cir. 1989)). In other words, a court should not disturb an ALJ’s denial of benefits if the decision “falls within the available zone of choice.” *Buckner v. Astrue*, 646 F.3d 549, 556 (8th Cir. 2011). A decision may fall within the “zone of choice” even where the court “might have reached a different conclusion had [the court] been the initial finder of fact.” *Id.* (quoting *Bradley v. Astrue*, 528 F.3d 1113, 1115 (8th Cir. 2008)). A reviewing court is directed to “defer heavily to the findings and conclusions” of the Social Security Administration. *Howard v. Massanari*, 255 F.3d 577, 581 (8th Cir. 2001).

ANALYSIS

The operative facts and arguments are thoroughly presented in the parties’ briefs and will not be duplicated here. Plaintiff contends the ALJ improperly determined the claimant’s residual functional capacity (RFC); improperly weighed the opinion evidence in the record; and erred in failing to find the claimant’s carpal tunnel syndrome to be a severe impairment (Doc. 8). The Court has reviewed the medical evidence in the record, the hearing testimony, and the ALJ’s opinion, and finds, consistent with the arguments of the defendant, that the ALJ’s decision is based upon substantial evidence on the record as a whole.

The ALJ did not err in his RFC determination. He discussed in detail the basis for his RFC assessment. Specifically, the ALJ thoroughly analyzed the claimant’s treatment history,

objective medical findings, the opinions of treating and examining physicians, the claimant's subjective complaints, and his day-to-day activities and limitations. The ALJ also properly considered and weighed the opinion evidence in the record. He gave good reasons for weight afforded to the three opinions appearing in the record and discounted aspects of those opinions not supported by the record, which is the ALJ's responsibility. *See Pearsall v. Massanari*, 274 F.3d 1211, 1219 (8th Cir. 2001) ("It is the ALJ's function to resolve conflicts among the opinions of various treating and examining physicians."). Finally, both the medical and opinion evidence in the record support the ALJ's finding that the claimant's carpal tunnel symptoms do not constitute a severe impairment.

Taken together, the ALJ's opinion is based upon substantial evidence on the record as a whole. Furthermore, the decision falls within the acceptable "zone of choice" of the finder of fact, to which the court gives great deference. Accordingly, the Court will not disturb the ALJ's denial of benefits.

Therefore, based on all the foregoing, **IT IS ORDERED** that the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 6, 2013

/s/ *David P. Rush*
DAVID P. RUSH
United States Magistrate Judge